

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webje.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION		
10/083,926	02/27/2002	Lixiao Wang	10527-395001 / 02-026	4859	
26161 FISH & RICH.	7590 09/16/200 ARDSON PC	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 102	2	SEVERSON, RYAN J			
MINNEAPOL	IS, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3731		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/16/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/083,926	WANG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Ryan Severson	3731		

	Ryan Severson	3731						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 22 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	THE REPLY FILED 22 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of th application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In or event, however, will the saturoty period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TM MONTHS OF THE EIGHAL BE INSTITUTION SEEMING POX 6707.)							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the polition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for pruposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension flee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a set for thin (b) above, if checked. A ny reply received by the Office late than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any sermed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (see NOTE below the proposed amendment (see NOTE	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);						
They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a cancel in the			ne issues for					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 								
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•						
7. \(\bigcirc \) For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		l be entered and an e	cplanation of					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4.6-18.20-34.43.73-78 and 82-93</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>19</u> .								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).					
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ad.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
/Todd E Manahan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731								

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

definition of the term "substantially" provided at any point in the specification.

As an initial matter, the claim amendments were entered because the only amendments made were to cancel previously withdrawn claims.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the second material extending through the body portion, tapered portions, and every portion of the balloon) are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuune, 388 F.2d 1181, 26 USPC2d 1087 (Fed. Cir. 1087). Therefore, applicant's argument that Grayzel does not show the material extending "substantially" the length of the balloon is not persuasive because the arguments and specification do not limit the claims to such a narrow interpretation and rever is no specific